

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,728	11/21/2000	C. Todd Praisner	WRKS:002	6772
['] 7590 07/07/2004			EXAMINER	
Brian W. Peterman			FULTS, RICHARD C	
O'KEEFE, EGAN & PETERMAN, L.L.P.				
Building C, Suite 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1101 Capital of Texas Highway South			3628	
Austin, TX 78746			DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
· ,	09/717,728	PRAISNER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
• %	Richard Fults	3628				
The MAILING DATE of this communication	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
· <u> </u>	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thin period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI statute, cause the application to become A emailing date of this communication, even if 21 November 2000. This action is non-final.	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). timely filed, may reduce any				
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)	thdrawn from consideration.	·				
··· <u> </u>	eminor					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview 9	Summary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/14, 9/6, 9/16/02. 	8) Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/717,728

Art Unit: 3628

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specifications do not define "dynamic payment identifier". The claims assert that this is a pre-approval system but the specifications is ambiguous because it describes both a pre-approval process and a post review process, and then describes the post review process as a pre-approval system.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Neither the specifications nor the claims define "dynamic payment identifier". The claims assert that this is a preapproval system but the specifications is ambiguous because it describes both a

Application/Control Number: 09/717,728

Art Unit: 3628

pre-approval process and a post review process, and then describes the post review process as a pre-approval system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 3. Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under USC 101 as the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. For a claim to be statutory under 35 USC 101 the following two conditions must be met:
- 1) In the claim, the practical application of an algorithm or idea results in a useful, concrete, tangible result,

AND

2) The claim provides a limitation in the technological arts that enables a useful, concrete, tangible result.

As to the technology requirement, note MPEP Section IV 2(b). Also note In re Waldbaum, 173USPQ 430 (CCPA 1972) which teaches "useful arts" is synonymous with "technological arts". In Musgrave, 167USPQ 280 (CCPA 1970), In re Johnston, 183USPQ 172 (CCPA 1974), and In re Toma, 197USPQ 852 (CCPA 1978), all teach a technological requirement.

The invention in the body of the claim must recite technology. If the invention in the body of the claim is not tied to technological art, environment, or machine, the claim is not statutory. Ex parte Bowman 61USPQ2d 1665, 1671 (BD. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001) (Unpublished)

Application/Control Number: 09/717,728

Art Unit: 3628

In addition, because it would have been common sense and advantageous to use the then existing technology of the credit card companies to set and use criteria for charges to be allowed against their credit cards and to communicate transactions, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have used that capability to perform the invention of the applicant.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Fults whose telephone number is 703-305-5416. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough, can be reached on (703)-305-0505. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

RCF

6/25/2004

JEFFREY PWU PRIMARY EXAMINER